

PROFESSOR FOSTER'S SPEECH

—ON THE—

CANADA PACIFIC RAILWAY RESOLUTIONS. DELIVERED IN THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS ON THE 12TH OF FEBRUARY, 1884.

MR. FOSTER—Mr. Speaker, I think the House will fully appreciate the difficult circumstances which surround me in attempting to speak upon this question. I think I feel as deeply as any hon. member opposite feels the importance of this question, the importance of the issues which are involved, and of the consequences which will result from our decision. I also feel that the subject presented to us is, in its main points, exceedingly simple; its salient points are but few, and these have been so thoroughly discussed by the strongest minds in this House, on both sides of it—and that is a compliment to the hon. member who has just sat down, which I am glad to make—that it leaves me very little chance with the exception of going over most of the ground which has been travelled before. We had, in the first place the very lucid and very strong statement by the Minister of Railways dealing with this whole matter. Following him, we had an equally strong and equally long statement by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, placing his side of the question before the House. Then, Sir, he was followed by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who in a temperate, well digested and lengthy speech, in which I thought I detected something of a malicious spirit as if he intended to dig into all sides of this question and thoroughly exhaust every possible calculation so as to try the ingenuity of those who might be so unfortunate as to come after him. When that hon. gentleman concluded the House was treated to a speech on this question by another hon. member who, in his

CLEVER, STRIKING AND ROLLYING WAY,

finding there was not much to hit in the question itself, struck right and left as each idea seemed to come out of the experience or incidents of the past. Then we had a comparatively short but remarkably able and patriotic speech by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who dealt with the question not only to the amusement and interest of the House, but also to the edification of the country. I must not omit to state that the hon. gentleman was followed by the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), who with his massive figures and logical presentation of facts made that same remarkable impression upon the House which he almost always makes upon it when he addresses it, and contributed his quota to the elucidation of this great subject. Then the House was treated to an hour or two hours disquisition by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), not King's, New Brunswick, but King's, Nova Scotia, for whom I have somewhat of a fellow feeling,

because we represent constituencies of the same name if not exactly of the same character. That hon. member laid the heavy hand of contribution upon all history, modern and profane, upon philosophy, moral and otherwise, and exhausted the poets, both sacred, ancient and modern; and now, Sir, we have listened to the elaborate and vigorous and strongly put, if not altogether argumentative and pertinent arguments of the hon. member for Queen's P. E. I., (Mr. Davies). Sir, I was a little amused, I am still a little amused; he began by complaining very much that other hon. members had not the remarkable power of concentration which he always exhibits, of omitting all outside issues and centralising his great power and strong reasoning upon the only issue before the House and the country. He complained very much that some other hon. members had taken up the time of the House in speaking a long time on topics

OUTSIDE OF THE POINT AT ISSUE,

and yet by the clock which faces me he spent one hour and five minutes before he came to the point at all, when he announced that he was going to give strong and cogent reasons why this proposal should not be looked upon with favor by the House. Sir, the hon. gentleman had fault to find with the hon. member for King's, N. S., because he commenced at Jerusalem and ended at Longfellow's "Ship of State." I could not help feeling, before the hon. gentleman had spent an hour or an hour and a quarter in getting to the point, that it was better to begin at Jerusalem and end at the "Ship of State," than to begin nowhere and end at the same place. The hon. gentleman started out with a vigorous attack upon the malignity displayed by this side of the House, and then with remarkable truthfulness he turned round to his own side of the House and administered to it a full slap on the forehead when he pronounced that malignity, a reciprocal malignity. We do not talk of reciprocity between members of the same family; we talk of reciprocity as a means of communication between members of different families and different nations; consequently, if this malignity which he declares has been shown by hon. members on this side of the House is reciprocal malignity, his own side, by his own admission, must have as large a share as we have. The hon. gentleman talked a little while about Conservative want of patriotism, and then in a very dark and mysterious but remarkably knowing way he hinted that if the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) only wished he could give the House very interesting information as to

VERY DARK AND TRICKY WAYS

of which he had had experience while a member of the Conservative party. Well, that is a characteristic, we know. You will always find when a man has not facts at hand and arguments which he can produce, he will always say that if he desired he could produce them, and if they were necessary they could be brought forth. Why did not the hon. gentleman in that long review of all the picnics which had taken place from the western coast of British Columbia to the furthest point of Cape Breton, give a single quotation from these speeches of my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White), in which were uttered those damaging and damning statements with respect to this country, thereby displaying a terrible lack of patriotism? It is all very well to say, in general terms, that such and such a thing could have been done, or has been done. I have often had a man come to me and make a great, big, large, general assertion; but the only thing which was necessary to quiet and cow such a man was to take him by the button hole and say: "Sir, I want the bill of particulars," and you had him quite cowed when you made that demand. It is easy to deal in general assertions; any person can do that, but it is a difficult thing to bring things specifically to a point. There are not many men, comparatively, who can do it, and I am inclined to think my hon. friend from King's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) falls amongst the latter category. The hon. gentleman begged the indulgence of the House for reading from *Hansard*. I was glad that he did read from *Hansard*, and do not think he had any reason for begging pardon from members of this House for doing so; in fact, I came to the conclusion that if the larger portion of his speech had consisted of quotations from *Hansard*, it would have contributed quite as much to the edification of the House and very much more to his own reputation than it did. The hon. gentleman delighted in representing the Syndicate, or the Railway Company, as being on their knees before this House and before the country. Sir, that is not an honest way of putting the matter; it is not an ingenuous way of placing it. I do not know of any set of men who are

ON THEIR KNEES ABJECTLY BEGGING

before this Parliament. Let us take a parallel case. Let us suppose that the hon. gentleman who sits in his seat before me, smiling so complacently, should engage a contractor to build his house, that the contractor had started upon the house, that he had made his plans and calculations for raising the money, but found when the house was three-fourths completed, that his plans had somehow or other not turned out as he had anticipated. Suppose he came to the hon. gentleman and said: "Sir, you see the amount of material I have; the amount of property I possess; I want an advance of money from you, as a loan, of so many thousand dollars. I have property good and re-

alizable to the extent of five times the amount, and if you will give me that loan I will finish the contract in two months instead of eight, and I will pay you a percentage on your money as large as you can get elsewhere." Would the hon. gentleman be justified in stating to his neighbor that this contractor was down on his knees, before him, asking for money? I think not, and I take it that this is an exactly similar or nearly similar case in point. The hon. gentleman delights in representing this amount as a drain upon the treasury, and not having the fate of many hon. gentlemen on his side of the House in his eyes, he indulges in precise prophecies. Sir, the preciseness of Vennor's prophecies amounts to nothing beside his; Wiggins' snow storm fame has no chance of lighting a candle beside the hon. member for Queen's, comparing the preciseness, the earnestness, and the certainty which they respectively predict. As he is equally precise as to the time; he does not leave himself much of a margin. He does not say, at some future time, or in a number of years, but in two years. In two years he says the company will be where? They will be here; they will not be

IMPORTUNING THE GOVERNMENT

somewhere else, but before this House, this Parliament, and for what? Asking them for a sum of money. And with what delightful precision the hon. gentleman states that sum of money; it will be exactly twenty-two and a half millions, not a dollar less or a dollar more. Now, sir, let me hold up before the eyes of the gentlemen present this prophecy. Let me ask my hon. friend from Queen's, especially, to jot it down in his note book, for fear he may forget, and if he and I live just two years from this 12th of February, 1884, we will meet some place, and compare notes with reference to this prophecy. If I am not greatly mistaken, if I had a reputation to lose, I would not care to risk it in such a reckless way as the hon. gentleman has risked his reputation today. The hon. gentleman, like two or three others before me, attacked my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), on a point on which my hon. friend's words probably led him to be misunderstood as conveying an idea which he did not wish to convey. It was this: that the Conservative party would lose their prestige, or, in other words, that it would be bad for the Conservative party if these resolutions were not carried, and that, therefore, the Conservative party must vote for them, not because it was good and necessary for the country, but because it was good and necessary for the Conservative party, and thus party considerations were placed above patriotic considerations. Sir, that, I apprehend, was not the intention of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe. What he meant to say was this: that the Conservative party in this railway policy had a record which had gone before the country, and that record

should not be falsified by their not carrying out, to the very letter, the idea with which they started, and with which they went before the people. What was that policy? The policy of the Liberal-Conservative party has been a railway, a railway on Canadian territory, a railway completed just as quickly as it possibly can be completed. In pursuance of that policy, in 1880 and 1881, they made a contract with the syndicate which

BOUND THEM TO BUILD THE ROAD BY 1891.

Sir, the Conservative party went to the country largely on that, they relied on these terms and conditions, and the country took them at their word, and sent them back here with a majority of 70 to carry out that idea. I say that we have an honorable and honest right to state, that the Conservative party has a policy and a record in this respect—a policy in favor of building this trans-continental line of railway as soon as it possibly can be built; and that the Conservative party, by the vast majority by which it was returned, in 1882, has been sent here, commissioned to carry out that idea, and that they would fail in their record, fail in their duty to this House and the people who sent them here by such a majority, if they did not carry out that idea with all the speed and promptness compatible with safety and security. That is what the hon. member from Richmond and Wolfe meant; that is what hon. members knew he meant, and that is something which

SHOULD NOT BE MISUNDERSTOOD

or misrepresented. The hon. gentleman has asked a question and asked it with a great deal of earnestness. He asks: "Has a single meeting been held in this country, in favor of this loan?" The hon. gentleman knows that that is just the reverse of the way in which it should be put. When the people make no sign, what is the inference therefrom? That they acquiesce; that they are in agreement with and favor the plan which is proposed. Ever since this house sat, and it sat early, it has been before the country that additional legislation would be had with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the idea has been mooted and sent abroad that that additional legislation would either make a provision for an increased out-and-out gift of a subsidy, or would take the form of a loan. That information has been before the country for a month or more. For nearly two months that idea has been before the country; and yet I challenged the hon. gentleman to point to the record of a single public meeting which has been called to protest against the action of this Government. I say that is proof conclusive that the public mind settled down to acquiescence in these proposals. Before this argument can have a feather's weight with the country or this House, the hon. gentleman will have to get up an agitation outside the party press, and show a spontaneous uprising of the people here and there throughout the country in protest against these terms.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

Mr. FOSTER.—In the remarks I was addressing to the House, I was dealing with the new or salient points of objection that had been raised by the hon. member for Queen's. I did not exhaust all the points which were made and which were merely iterations or repetitions of those that had been made and largely answered in speeches which preceded. In the remarks which I shall now address to the House, I wish to speak first, Sir, of three broad, general facts, upon which is based a necessity, as I think, for the position which we take with reference to this whole railroad question. I wish, then, to speak for a few moments of the question as it is presented to us in the Resolutions which are before the House; and afterwards I propose, with the kind indulgence of the House, to take some notice of the points which have been raised and put forth as arguments why these Resolutions should not pass. In the first place, then, with regard to the three broad or general facts upon which, as I think, is based the railroad policy of this party, as embodied in its latest phase in the Resolutions before the House.

We often hear the remark, Sir, that a country does not amount to much without a people. That is very true; but I think it is equally true that a people never amounts to much without a country. I believe, Sir, that the material is not by any means the most important factor in the development of national greatness, and the

UPBUILDING OF NATIONAL PERMANENCY.

I believe, Sir, that there is a sentiment, indefinable, but very strong and very creative, which is sometimes known by the name of patriotism, which is written as one of the broadest facts upon the history of the past, which is no less a fact in the development of the present, and which no statesman and no deliberative assembly can afford to ignore. It is that feeling, Sir, which makes us proud and confident of our own country, which creates within us a desire, an overmastering desire, to make it rival, and if possible excel, any other country, which calls forth the best energies of a people to embody and realize that desire, which joins together dismembered parts and diversities of opinion and of interest in order to attain the object desired, which throws its halo, Sir, of hope and confidence over the darkest period of a nation's development, and which crowns seeming impossibilities with triumphant success. This feeling, Sir, I believe to be a factor which is indispensable in the development of any people, dowered even with the richest material resources, and a factor which has been proved over and over again in the history of the world, to have brought forth wonderful transformations, to have built up splendid and enduring nationalities out of elements which have been disjointed, disunited and surrounded with difficulties. If

you, Sir, and the House will pardon me for a moment, I may be allowed to remark that years ago, when seated, as a school-boy, on the school form and making my first explorations into that wonderful field of geography and history, followed out with all a boy's eager enthusiasm, the birth, the progress, the growth and the splendid outflowing of national greatness, I was interested in every step, I participated in every struggle, I felt sad at every reverse, and I rejoiced at every victory; and I remember perfectly well the feeling that often and often came foremost in my mind, that I wished, I too, were a citizen of a country which was large and great—which either had

IN ITS STORIED PAST A GRANDEUR

to fall back upon, or which had a future out of which it could carve that grandeur for itself. I felt the lack of that, I felt a spirit stirring within me, a desire that that void might be filled. As I have grown, I have felt more and more the yearning for a country of which I might be proud, of which the future possibilities were grand, and might be said to be almost illimitable. There were many other boys in similar forms, in similar schools, all over this Dominion, that were feeling the very same lack, and had the very same desire stirring within them. There had been boys of generations previous who had felt the same lack, and had been stirred with a similar desire. These boys of generations past, have grown up to be men, but they have not lost their desire. Those of my own generation are growing up to be men, but they have lost none of the ardor and strength of that desire, and out of that desire, born generations back and nurtured through the generations that intervened, there sprang the idea of Confederation, which, in 1867, became a fixed fact. I welcomed the idea of Confederation, welcomed it at the outset, outside of all the difficulties and conditions which surrounded it. I left the arrangement of these difficulties to older heads. It was sufficient to me that the idea which had been born within me, which had been nurtured and was strong within me, had at last come to its embodiment, and had been engrafted in the country. Our four Provinces became a country. The provincial life which had been bounded by narrow limits flowed out afresh in a wider sweep and came back again to the different parts of the confederated Provinces fraught with a new life and a new impulse.

But that was not all that was needed. These four Provinces of Canada that became merged in one Dominion were old; their names were familiar; they had been known from the seventeenth century. The names of Upper and Lower Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, were old familiar names, the mention of which excited no fresh enthusiasm, awakened no new interest, had no new attractive power. Outside of the impulse which the confederation of those four Provinces gave to the life of the people of those Provinces, the Confederation of 1867,

stopped short of that which was needed. There was needed after that the electric shock of a new idea; the new idea that there was a background of illimitable resources, that there was a

COUNTRY WITH A GREAT PROSPECT

and a wonderful fertility which should stand as the background of the old picture to attract to us the attention, not only of people nearly related to us in blood and friendship, but the attention and the gaze of the civilized world. The very same thing was needed here that was necessary when the life of Europe had become stagnant in its views. Its people, looking out across the Atlantic Ocean, descried the far distant shores of a new country, opened up to themselves a new world and were filled with an impulse to which they had been strangers for centuries past. New enterprises were set on foot, and out of the older world streamed into the newer many immigrants; out of it flowed many a department of progress which found not only its development in the new world, but brought back that width of movement, that breadth of idea, that strong spirit of liberty, which returning upon the motherland and fatherland, have done more to bring about liberty of government and liberty of social development than any one influence with which we are acquainted. The very same was necessary when the New England States had grown to be old. All at once the great west was opened; a wonderful background of widest promise for the development of the richest resources and this attracted the gaze of Europe and brought its stream of emigrants and made its enterprise and spirit and impulse of life, wide and broad and deep. That same thing was necessary for our Confederation of 1867, and it came in 1870-71 and 1872. The new North West was opened to the gaze of the world, was annexed to the older Provinces, and we possessed a Dominion which extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific and which had its wide resources, great fertility, and wonderful power, first opened to the gaze and attracting the attention of the world.

IN 1867 WE GAINED A COUNTRY.

In 1870 and 1872 we extended that country to wide bounds and made it more a country to be proud of, with greater resources and greater possibilities that we had hoped for at the period of the first amalgamation of the Provinces.

But something was necessary besides this. The elements that made up this new country of 1871-72, were widely diversified and widely scattered. British Columbians had hardly heard of Nova Scotians and New Brunswickers. The Province of Quebec with a different language, different blood, and a different mode of expressing its religious aspirations lay very largely unknown to the people of the Maritime Provinces and the people of even the Western and newer Provinces. It was necessary, in order that we should have a great country of which we could be proud, that we should have a united country. The very same spirit which drove

us into Confederation in 1867, which drove us to the extension of our territory in 1870, stopped not, would not stop, will never stop until the country is amalgamated and united in the best possible way. What are the different methods of growing people together and uniting them? If we go back and take a slight look at the history of the world what do we find these things to be? They are first, race and language. The people of the same race, the people of the same language, separated from others of a different race and a different language, and necessarily thrown in upon themselves, are amalgamated, are united, are forced to make a community in themselves and grow up with mutual interests and mutual objects. These, Sir, were the two chief things that united the nationality of the Greeks which, with a different language and a different blood, sprung up from the old world, which, with a language that was not spoken by those who bordered upon them, made of the outside world barbarians, and united them together in the strong and

PERMANENT BONDS OF A NATIONAL LIFE.

Sir, there is another influence which may unite countries together—it is the influence of Government. One country grows up with a republican form of Government, another with a monarchical form of Government. The very fact that these two exist, side by side—different forms of Government has a tendency to throw together all who live under the one form of Government—and to throw together all who live under the other form of Government, and so to make the two nationalities cling closer together in their interests and in their mutual relations. There is also, I think, sir, another influence which binds nationalities together. It is this, sir: it is the influence of similarity or oneness of institution—institution in its broadest sense, taking in the benevolent and charitable institutions, taking in the religious institutions, the educational institutions, all that we may group under this broad name of the institutions of a people. These, I think, are the three chief influences which, in the past, and, to a certain extent, in the present, tend to unite groups of people in the oneness of a national life, in a unity of aim and of interest. Now, sir, the point of my remarks, in travelling thus far, as it may seem to some hon. gentlemen, outside of the record, is this; to show that, in this new country, neither of these three can be considered a factor in making a complete and united nationality of the Dominion of Canada. It cannot, sir, be, race and language, for the country to the south of us has the same blood in its veins, speaks the same language and it forms no dividing line between the two; and, consequently, it throws neither the one nor the other back to seek a unity and oneness amongst itself. Neither is there a sufficient difference in Government between ourselves and the country to the south of us. There is, when we come to dig down to the essence of these two forms of Govern-

ment, a fundamental difference which is of the greatest importance, and which I hope, standing here with my present thought and my present feeling, to see perpetuated instead of to see obliterated; but, for the general mass of the people of these two countries there is no very perceptible difference of Government which should keep the two apart. Neither is there any

PERCEPTIBLE DIFFERENCE OF INSTITUTION.

Our forms of education, or religious establishments, all those which are grouped under the name of institutions are very much the same. What is it, then, that, in this day and on this continent, with respect to these two people of which I am speaking, the Canadian people and the people of the United States, can tend to bring us, draw us, and hold us together in bonds of national unity, with a oneness of aim and a oneness of interest? I think I will speak within the knowledge of all when I say that there is only one thing to do it, that is, a continuous, a speedy, and an uninterrupted bond of communication between all parts of the country, making every distinct member and section of this country easy of access to every other member and section of the country. That is the element that is to bind us together. Our merchants are to know each other from British Columbia to Cape Breton; our people are to become acquainted with each other from the Provinces by the sea to the Provinces in the far North West, as long as and wherever they may be formed; we are to draw together as the members of one family; Ontario is to cease sitting down here by the broad lake, thinking that she is sufficient to herself, and caring nothing for those who are about her, especially the smaller Provinces away by the sea; the smaller Provinces down by the sea are to forget their prejudices against these upper Provinces, and are to become better acquainted with them in interest and in social relations; the Province of Quebec is to come and join hands with the people of other Provinces, and we of the other Provinces are to become better acquainted with our *confreres* of the Province of Quebec, and, learning to know them better, are to learn to like them better. So, in all ways, whatever can take place to bind together the trade interest, the social interest, all the interests of the different parts of this great Confederation, is the thing which shall draw us together, keep us together, and make of us

A LIVING AND PROGRESSIVE UNITY,

in a national or country point of view. Now, one step farther. What is the kind of communication which we can have which shall join these Provinces together? Can we have a water communication which would be sufficient? No, Sir; that is impossible. Outside of the difficulty of having a water communication at any season of the year, for more than one half the width of this continent of ours there is another half of the year when the ice king lays his hand upon that

form of communication, and makes it impassable to us. The only form of communication which is adequate, which is continuous, which is uninterrupted and uniform is that communication which comes from the construction and opening and completion of a trans-continental line of railway, which shall gather, Sir, in one hand the outlying Provinces of the far east, and in the other the outlying Provinces of the far west, and shall unite in bonds of intercourse and trade and social communication all the different parts of this country with every other part. Now, the whole point of this latter train of thought, in connection with the other two, is this: I honestly believe that, if all the politicians of 1867 and all the newspapers of 1867, had joined themselves to battle down this idea of the confederation of the Provinces, they might have retarded it, but a generation or two would have raised up a new set of politicians and planted a new set of newspaper presses which would have brought to its development and embodiment that longed-for, wished-for idea.

OF A UNION OF THESE PROVINCES.

I believe in the same way that, if all these different influences had chosen to pit themselves against the attainment, against the opening up and joining to these Provinces of the North West Territory and the more remote Provinces, they might have hindered and retarded it for a time; but it was in the hearts of the people, and could only be hindered for a time, it must reach its fruition and have its embodiment. In the same way, I earnestly and honestly believe that this same idea is as warm and deep and earnest in the hearts of the people, that the confederation of the four Provinces is not complete, that the confederation and joining together of every part of this Dominion is not complete, that it will not be held to be complete, until the iron bands of a railway trans-continental and Canadian, shall join every part of this great Dominion together in the bonds of commercial and of social intercourse. Therefore, I was in favour of Confederation because it gave us a country, I was in favour of this expansion to the bounds we now have, because it gave us a great an illimitable country, I am in favour, and cannot but be in favour, of the speedy and quick and certain construction of that which is essentially necessary to make us a united, and so a permanent, a successful, and a progressive people. So much then for these thoughts, these three broad facts which lead up inevitably to the policy which has been adopted by this party, and which is propounded by the Government which this party has formed, which has been initiated by them, and in furtherance of which the Resolutions which we at present have before us are being discussed. Now, Sir, when we come to this solid foundation, that a railroad, a trans-continental road, is necessary for us in order to complete the idea of the unity and oneness of this country,

THREE GREAT PLANS ARE PRESENTED

or have been presented, to the people of this

country. There was, sir, the plan of 1872, which offered to grant 54,700,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000 to a company for the building of the road. There was a second plan of 1874, by which it was proposed to grant \$10,000 cash as a subsidy per mile, 10,000 acres of land as a subsidy per mile, and 4 per cent. on any balance which was considered necessary to complete the different contracts, for the period of twenty-five years. In 1881 there was a third plan, which we are now discussing—to a certain extent—by which a company was to be given \$25,000,000, 25,000,000 acres of land, and completed railway to the amount of \$28,000,000. I may state, sir, that very early in the consideration of this great question it came to be a settled fact that this road should be constructed, if possible, not by a government but by a company. Well, sir, of these three plans, which can we assent to, and which do we consider to be the best in the interests of the country? The two plans that I mentioned at first are out of the calculation. Why? Because no one could be found to avail themselves of the terms which were offered. The third one became feasible because a company was found who was willing to take hold of it under those terms and to push the railway to completion. Therefore I say that those who believed in the necessity of a trans-continental railway believed that it should be built as quickly as possible, and there was no plan to take hold of, but the plan of 1880-81, which was taken up by a company and which thereafter looked as if it might be carried through. And so, sir, the discussions of 1880-81 took place. Parliament came to a certain conclusion; it ratified the contract; it made the conditions firm, and it looked then to a completion of this road by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the amounts which I have mentioned. Now, sir, there were three considerations why the country and why this Parliament took hold of and ratified that contract. First, because it gave a prospect of a complete road within a definite time, which was never held out to the people before. It held out the prospect of the completion of the road in 1891.

A DEFINITE PERIOD WAS FIXED

and we had something sure to look forward to. There was another reason for which Parliament and the country, I believe, were disposed to ratify that contract, and that was that there was what the hon. gentlemen opposite have talked so much of, an element of finality about it. The cost was fixed; there was a certain number of acres of land and a certain amount of money. It measured the liabilities of the country, and the people were glad that they knew at last what the cost of this Canadian Pacific Railway would probably be to the country. There was also a third reason, which was this: That the line had better not be built by a Government. Now, Sir, I am free to say that I have no objection whatever to a Government running a railway. In fact,

Sir, as I grow older, and look a little deeper into things, I am of the opinion that it would not be a bad thing for the Government to own and run all the railways of a country. I am not disposed, therefore, to be against the running of a road by a Government. But I appreciated the danger which other hon. gentlemen appreciated, and which, I am sure, this country appreciated—the danger of the risk involved in a Government attempting to build a railway of such dimensions, and of such enormous expenditure. Sir, the patronage, and the vindictiveness of party which is involved in the letting, and making, and criticism of contracts are almost insuperable objections to a Government undertaking to build a road of such dimensions and involving such cost. So, Sir, I say the country was willing to ratify that contract for three special reasons: First, because it fixed a time at which the road should be finished; secondly, because it made a finality, as far as expenditure was concerned; and thirdly, because it had the road built by a company, and avoided the risk and danger incident to the building of such an immense road by a Government organized on a party basis. So much, then, with reference to the contract. Now, Sir, in 1881, the Company went to work. It has, I am bound to say, displayed

AN IMMENSE AMOUNT OF PUSH

and energy—a fact that is not questioned by the country at large, or by any section of the people. It has kept good faith with reference to its contract, and has built a *bona fide* road, much better than the road which was laid down to guide it as a model. It has put force and energy and power into the enterprise, so much so that at the end of 1883 it stands before us with 1,131 miles of completed road on the main line west, with 269 miles of completed, equipped and running branches on that same line west, and with 470 odd miles east of Callander, taking in the branches and the main line from Montreal and Brockville; and as far west as Callander and running up to Algoma Mills. That is what has been done by the company, and more than that has been done. Such has been the energy and push they have displayed, such has been the rapidity with which they have constructed the work, that they have raised the belief of the people that the road would be finished in 1886 and not in 1891. So that they stand before the country and before the world in the latter part of the year 1883 as having accomplished all that work of which I have spoken, and as holding out to Canada and to

ALL COUNTRIES INTERESTED IN CANADA, the hope that this road would be built entirely by 1886. Now, Sir, a new phase of the question is presented to us—a phase of the question, I am bound to say, as unwelcome as it was unexpected, a phase of the question which is equally painful to gentlemen on this side of the House as it was to gentlemen on the other side of the House;

a phase of the question which we and the country had hoped would never be presented, and which we are sorry has ever been presented. What is that phase? Sir, they come to Parliament in the Session of 1884, through the Government, and they say: we have raised the hopes of Canada and of the world that this road would be finished in 1886. We based those hopes upon calculations that we thought were good and would hold. We have to come, to you today and say that we must fall back on our original contract and finish that road by 1891; or else, in order to finish it by the end of 1885, we must ask you for a loan. That is the question that is presented to Parliament and the country—1891 on the one hand, and 1885 and a loan upon the other hand. Now, Sir, I, as an Independent member of this House—

Some hon. members—Hear, hear.

MR. FOSTER—I supposed, sir, that I should have a general chorus of hear, hear, from the opposite side of the House. I say to the hon. gentlemen opposite who are so prodigal just now with their hear, hear, that though it may be a most unheard of and unthought of thing to them for a man to sit on one side of the House, and whilst he supports with all his power, and with all his earnestness, the party of his choice on broad lines of policy, it is still quite possible for him to make up his mind, as an independent thinker and investigator, upon every subject which does not come within party lines. I am supported in this opinion by what has taken place in this house this session. There has been more

INDEPENDENT AND SCATTERING VOTING

on this side of the House by members supporting the Conservative party, than there has been on the other side. And so I say, as a man who supports a party and yet who does and will think independently, and conclude independently, I am bound to take this matter into my consideration and find out whether or not it is reasonable. Now, sir, what reasons did the company give when they came to this Government and Parliament. They said this: owing to hostility and hostile combinations at home and abroad; owing to shrinkage in values and a decline in the price of stocks; owing to the difficulty of realizing such large sums as are necessary to carry on this gigantic work, from lands which are, to a certain extent, locked up from a speedy realization, and which, if thrown upon the market would bring but ruinous prices, we come and say: we have resources sufficient; we want a loan; we will pay you a fair interest; we will finish the road by the end of 1885; we ask your consideration as to whether or not our proposal is a reasonable one. Sir, the company does not come on bended knees before this House. This company comes as a man would come walking straight on his feet, looking up straight with his eyes and saying to this Government and Parliament: we have

A FAIR PROPOSAL TO MAKE TO YOU;

we ask you for a loan; we will give you as high a rate of interest as you can get elsewhere and even better; we will place within your hands sufficient security; that is your part of the bargain—will you do it? We will be helped in certain particulars; you will be helped in certain other particulars; if you will accept our proposition, well and good; if you will not, well and good; and we fall back on the terms of the original contract. What I have to conclude in my own mind is whether these are reasonable grounds or not. As to the first one. Has there been hostility manifested, and have hostile combinations been entered into with respect to this company? I think that no hon. member will deny it; I do not think hon. members opposite will deny it. I call to mind that the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Davies), acknowledged that such was the case, but he did not see any reason why, if such were the case, the company should go whining around, as he elegantly and classically expressed it. Then there was a hostile spirit. It was expressed in what way? It was exhibited by hostile combinations of rival roads in the great stock markets of the world. It was shown in hostile articles which were written from this country to American papers, and in telegrams sent from this country to American papers, and in cablegrams sent to the Old Country. In these and a hundred different ways, the fact is as clear as the sun at noon-day that

THERE WERE HOSTILE COMBINATIONS,

that there was hostility both at home and abroad, and that this hostility must have had and did have an effect on the securities and assets of the company. Sir, is the second contention a reasonable one—that there was a shrinkage of values generally throughout the country and a demoralization and fall in the value of stocks. We have only to read the stock list, to take the most cursory glance at the commercial records of the world for the last eight, six or four months, to establish the fact. Looking at these points I say, it is a reasonable contention on the part of the company that they were prevented from realizing many of their assets by the demoralization of the stock market and shrinkage in values. As to the third contention, it is an eminently reasonable one. To meet the expenditure necessary, to raise the amount necessary to meet that expenditure, and to raise the amount within a period of two years upon lands which are slow sales comparatively, and on stock for which there was no market at that particular time on account of the demoralized condition of the market—it is a reasonable contention they urge that in these respects they have encountered difficulties which they had not reckoned upon when they made their calculations and estimates years and months ago. As an independent member, making up my mind from data presented before me, I cannot refuse to admit the contention that these are reasonable reasons, and that I am bound, as one considering the issues involved,

to give them my fairest and most impartial consideration. Apart from these considerations, the question narrows itself down to this: Is there any great or important reason which commends itself to my mind, and which leads me to believe that it is better for the country's welfare to have the road finished in 1885, rather than have the completion postponed until 1891. That is the first question I have to settle with myself. Mind you, I am in favor of the road as

A MEANS TOWARDS NATIONAL UNITY

and national progress. Mind you, I believe this company have done exceedingly well in the progress of the work so far. Remember that I take into consideration, as I must do, their contention that owing to the circumstances to which I have referred they have been thrown out in their calculations. The question for me to decide is this: is there any counterbalancing advantage in having the road opened in 1885, sufficient to make us take upon ourselves to do what is embodied as reasonable and necessary in the resolutions before the House. I think I have settled that question, so far as to make me, at least, act in a certain way. One reason that it is better to have the road finished by the end of 1885, is because it is in the interests of Canada abroad that such should be done. I know that what I am going to urge as a reason will be called by hon. gentlemen opposite a sentimental reason. I do not therefore refrain from urging it. By the push and energy exhibited by this country, with its 4,500,000 of people, determining to do what, on the part of the country to the south, with its 38,000,000, was considered a bold and daring enterprise, Canada has obtained a certain name and prestige among the people of Europe, and even the people of the civilized world. If a person advertised himself to perform some great athletic feat, and when it came near the time of performance, and when the spectators had gathered and the thought of the community was centered upon him, and if his previous performances had led to the conviction that he was able to do that which he had set himself to perform, and he failed at the last moment, his reputation would be lost. Just so in a similar, but in a larger and more important way, would the prestige and fame of Canada be diminished if we were to fail now in the prosecution of this work. In hundreds of thousands of homes in England, Ireland and Scotland they are sitting round their firesides tonight talking about

THAT PLUCKY CANADIAN DOMINION,

which, with its 4,500,000 of people, has undertaken to weld all its parts together by building a railway 3,000 miles in length. They are reading documents which have been scattered by this Government, and by means of this very same railway organization, and their thought and feelings, and sympathies, are being drawn out to this country of Canada as a field for immigration, and as a country whose people are full of energy, full of enterprise, as shown by the very fact that

they have undertaken, and promised to perform, this gigantic work, and have it finished by 1886. Now, sir, are these promises to be falsified? Once let this idea be overthrown, and they shall assemble again about their firesides and say, ah! there has been a failure over there in Canada; they undertook more than they could carry out; they promised well, but they failed in performance; and there goes down the *prestige* of Canada; there goes down at least a part of that attraction which this country has had, as a field for immigration, and there, I believe, the name and the fame and the interest of Canada will suffer in a very vital and important way. Therefore I conclude in my own mind—hon. gentlemen may take it for what it is worth—that it is important that this scheme should be carried out; that it is the general sentiment that it should be carried out, and that it is all important that it should proceed because of the interest and the fame and the credit of Canada in countries abroad. But intimately connected with this is the great subject of immigration. No one doubts that this very building and construction and completion of this trans-continental railway has been one of the best things which this country has put forward as an attraction for immigration, in all parts of the world from which we draw our immigration. It is no doubt a fact that the opening up of such an immense country by

AN UNBROKEN LINE OF RAILWAY,

so that these people might have communication with the Old Country, and have intercourse in different ways with the outside world, has been of the very greatest importance and utility in attracting immigrants into this country, and not only in attracting those who have already come over here, but in starting that spirit of desire, that spirit of looking forward, that spirit which says: there is the country to which, if we change we shall change to; a spirit which is as seed sown in a fertile soil, which will bring forth, as year passes on year, its increasing harvest of immigration to this country. I believe that if today the Parliament of Canada should decide that this great work should stop and not be carried to its promised completion, that it shall loiter along and hesitate till 1891, the immigration interests of this country would be sadly and importantly affected by that course of conduct. So, I am in favor of having this work pushed through by the end of 1885, for the sake of our immigration interests. There are reasons at home, too. One of the first is the North-West development. A gentleman speaking on the other side of the House said: cannot we get into the North-West now? True, but we have to cross a foreign country.

Some hon. members.—No, no.

MR. FOSTER.—Hon. gentlemen have not lived to the length of years to which they have lived, and felt the snows which have fallen on their heads, and seen the ice which has taken hold of river and harbor in all these years, without knowing that there is a large

portion of the year in which it is impossible to carry on that speedy and safe and uninterrupted communication, which we need for the purposes for which this trans-continental railway is to be built. Sir, there is a sentimental reason which comes in, but it is a forcible one. What would you think of unity of family life, what would be your interest in your home, if every time you got up from your breakfast table to go to your library, you had to pass through apartments which were owned and controlled by some other person? Would you feel that you had a home of your own? Would you feel the same love for its roof? Aside from the inconvenience which would be inevitable, there would be a taking away of the feeling that it was your own home, and that you were under your own roof. Hon. gentlemen opposite may think that this is a very pleasant thing, and they may smile about it, but it has force with me, and with the people of this country; it has force, and it will have force, in shaping

OUR POLICY ON THIS QUESTION.

A person knows very little about railroading if he does not know that when a company has a line of railway 1,000 miles long away over there, and a line of railway 500 or 600 miles long on this side, and between them there is only a means of joining them by running their freights and passengers on a road which belongs to a different country, with hostile tariffs, and with another system, and all the possible inconveniences which may arise—I say a person knows little of railroading if he does not know, that the expense and inconvenience incident to that sort of thing is one of the strongest arguments that can be used to those people to obtain an independent, self-controlled, and through line of communication open for themselves. I say, therefore, that we have not an open means of communication, such as is at all adequate, from these older Provinces to the heart of the North-West territory. I say we need that line, that the development of the North-West depends on it, that the number of immigrants we get there, the amount of produce which is raised there, the amount of minerals which is taken out from their mines, and all the vast development of that country depend, more perhaps than we think, upon the speedy, continuous and uninterrupted communication which shall take place between this part and that part of our country—this an older and stronger one, but that a newer one, and full of greater possibilities, and capable of the greatest amount of expansion. Our British Columbia development needs it. Sir, since our confederation with British Columbia, that province

HAS STAYED AWAY OUT BY ITSELF

for all these years, with three-fourths, five-sixths, yes, nineteen-twentieths of her people strangers to us commercially and socially, and is she to remain there until 1891, with all the disadvantages which result from that isolation? But if we carry out this idea,

and complete the road by 1885, there are six years in which British Columbia and all of its resources are opened to free course for the stream of enterprise which will rush in, and the stream of trade and commerce which will rush out. Is that nothing for British Columbia—is it nothing to this Dominion? I hold that it is something to the provinces by the sea; and that it is something very important to the rest of this great Dominion which lies east of it. But, sir, our trade, our industries demand it. We are building a trans-continental line of railway, and do we not know that trade springs up in proportion to the facilities for trading? Sir, I want to have it as thoroughly impressed upon my mind as I possibly can, that conditions differ now from what they were in the old time of pioneer settlement in this and other new countries. Today people rush in where there are facilities for rushing out as well as there are facilities for going in. They follow the course of the railroad; and with reference to branch lines, I maintain that if the main line is thoroughly finished and equipped by 1885, instead of 1891, you will have a far larger number of branch lines built by the end of 1891 than you possibly could have if you carried the building of the main line through all those years until 1891. Some hon. gentlemen are very anxious to have branch lines built. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared that he believed it would have been better for the country and the North-West if this railroad had stopped at Winnipeg, and the people had been allowed to build branch lines west of Winnipeg. Branch lines where, pray? Why, each one of those branch lines would become a main line. What use is a line of railroad that does not run into a market centre? Those branch lines would

HAVE TO RUN TO WINNIPEG

at least, and make connection with the main line. So that the building of the main line must be antecedent to the successful, continuous and rapid building of branch lines. I believe the interest of our own country, the interest of our trade and industries in the eastern Provinces, demand that this line of communication should be opened up. Sir, what has been accomplished in the last five years? There has been developed and opened up a trade between our eastern industries and British Columbia and Manitoba; and today no inconsiderable feeder for the industries of the eastern Provinces is to be found in the population which is producing from the lands and from the mines of those western parts of our newly-opened territory. Sir, if this line is put through by 1885, these industries will not be harmed. They will feel the impulse. They will then be able to send their wares through without any interruptions in the shape of bonding or of hostile tariffs, through the whole heart of that country and to send on to British Columbia what is necessary for the people of that Province. I believe that our own industries

will not be injured, but, on the contrary, will be very much helped by the speedy construction of this road. These, sir, are the reasons, which amongst others, induce me to favor the completion of this road by 1885, rather than have it set back until 1891—that is, provided we think we can reasonably do it.

Now, sir, I wish for a moment to look at the nature of this loan. What is it? The company come and ask this Parliament for a loan of \$22,500,000. Recollect that we must argue upon the idea that this is a *bona fide* transaction. But someone asks, what about the \$7,380,000, part of which has been postponed until 1888, and the rest of which is due in 1888. What about it? It is no liability to this country until 1888? and

IF THE COMPANY FULFIL THEIR PART

of this agreement, which we believe they will, it will not then become a liability to this country, because it will then be paid. That is one of the conditions of this agreement. So that the loan is this—\$22,500,000 to be paid in 1891, and a contingent loan of \$7,380,000, which is only contingent upon the possibility or the probability, however you may choose to regard it, that in 1888 the company will not be able to pay that amount. Now, sir, for this loan the company agree to pay 5 per cent. interest—a better rate of interest than we can get elsewhere—a rate which is greater than that at which we borrow. So that, if this is a *bona fide* transaction—and we must argue it upon that line—we are to loan \$22,500,000 at 5 per cent., and we are to have this percentage paid to us half-yearly. Now, then, the second great question which comes to my mind for conclusion is this: Granted that it is better to have this road built by the end of 1885; granted that we are able to provide the loan asked for, is the security sufficient? And until I can convince myself with all certainty, so far as certainty is possible, that the security is sufficient, I, sir, would not vote for these resolutions. One moment, then, Mr. Speaker, while we take a glance at the nature of the security. In the first place, we have a railroad of some 1,131 miles of main line, the construction value of which is \$23,078,929; we have 269 miles of branches west of Callander worth, at construction value, \$3,759,793; we have expended on improvement of the line west of Cross Lake, \$353,606; we have rolling stock, plant, lake steamers, and the like, \$6,870,045; and we have material and supplies, less the advance of rails, \$4,025,604; making a total of \$38,087,977. This is the amount in actual cost value of the line west of Callander, which is to be placed in our hands as part security. In addition to this, there is east of Callander 457 miles of extension main line and branches, \$3,270,351; rolling stock, worth \$900,000; shops and machinery, worth \$516,032; tools and machinery, \$352,230; real estate for termini, worth \$390,790; making a total of \$5,429,403, the value of security east of Callander. If we add these we get a total present

RAILROAD SECURITY OF \$43,517,370.

That is the actual value at present of the security placed into the hands of this Government for the loan asked. But I am not unaware of the fact, and I am alive to its importance as well, that this security is of such nature that it appreciates with every dollar the Government pays out to their call of the loan which has been stipulated for. That, with me, weighs as an important point, and I believe it weighs as an important point with this House. Of the loan of \$22,500,000 which this Government is asked for, \$7,500,000 go for floating liabilities and \$15,000,000 are to go into the road. There is besides the subsidy yet to be paid which the company owns, which we have guaranteed the company, by the contract of 1881, and which, if they carry out their contract is no more ours than a section of land in the moon is ours. That \$12,710,788 has also to be paid out and applied to the construction of the road, making a total of \$27,710,788 to go into its construction. Now, my point is this: The very moment we can float this contract and make them the loan of \$22,500,000, we have the present value of the railway worth \$43,517,370. The Government has to see that every dollar of the \$27,000,000 that they pay to the company is represented by actual construction of the road, so that when the two years have past, and the end of 1885 has come, and all this loan and subsidy are paid to the company, we will have an actual railroad value of \$27,710,788 to add to the other \$43,517,370 as a gross security for the payment of the loan. That is we have a security in a railroad which is not a diminishing but is an appreciative security, and which grows by the amount of every dollar which is paid over of that loan and that subsidy into the hands of the company. That gives us, at the end of two years, a railroad security worth, in construction value, \$71,228,158. But that is not the only security we have. We have also the security of the land amounting to 21,240,600 acres. Against this 21,240,600 acres of land handed over to the Government as additional security, there is a lien of \$1,123,125, which leaves, if we can

TAKE THE VALUE OF THE LAND

at the the price which has been already realized for what has been sold—\$2.36 an acre—we have a balance of some \$49,019,795 represented to us in worth of lands placed in the hands of this Government as additional security. That is, we have in railway and landed security, at that rate of calculation, \$120,247,953. Is that sufficient security for a loan of \$22,500,000 and a contingent loan of \$7,380,000, which never will be called for if this agreement is carried out. Is a security of \$5 for every dollar that is loaned considered to be sufficient security? There is another point which adds greater force to this—will that railway property depreciate from this till 1891, supposing it runs so long? Will it depreciate in value between this and 1885? No, sir; it is constantly appreciating in value. The railroad property which is

represented in the equipment and rolling stock of the road is kept and must be kept up to its level, and can be kept up to its level, because it has a paying traffic. It is therefore a security that will not depreciate but appreciate in value. How is it with reference to the lands? I have calculated these lands at the rate of \$2.36 per acre. Does that calculation seem to be too high? I think not. I think we can test it very well by the amount which has been already received for what has been already sold, and that is at the rate of \$2.36 per acre. I think, however, we can take a little more in argument out of analogous roads. I go over to the Union Pacific road and I find that its lands sold, from 1880 to 1883, at from \$4.28 to \$4.82 an acre; I find that the Kansas Pacific lands sold at from \$4.03 to \$4.93 an acre; I find that the sales of the Central Pacific lands averaged, since 1870, \$4.85 per acre; I take the Northern Pacific, which is more analogous to our own road, because it has the element of newness to a certain extent, and their lands, in 1882, sold for from \$2.60 to \$3.60 per acre. Now we have this fact that the lands already sold of the Canadian Pacific Railway have averaged \$2.36 per acre; that sales of lands on analogous roads averaged from \$2.60 to \$5 per acre in round numbers, and I think I have fair ground for the contention that the remainder of those lands of our road will be

WORTH AN AVERAGE OF \$2.36 PER ACRE

at least. Will these lands depreciate or appreciate in value? They must appreciate in value every year, on account of the increased impetus which is being given to buying and selling them, so that the value of real estate will creep up, especially within a certain distance of the great line of railway, and these lie within that distance. To my mind, there is no question that the security offered for the loan asked is amply sufficient. If it comes to be a fact, if the possibility ever becomes a probability, and that probability ever merges into a fact, that the company makes default and is not able to carry out its obligation, I, as an humble member of this Parliament, will not be sorry to see so valuable a property fall into the hands of the Government and the people, at so small a price. It would be a good thing for the country and a bad thing for the company, after the expenditure of all the energy and capital they have put into this gigantic enterprise. There is one other consideration I will trouble the House with, in reference to this. Is the road, provided it falls into our hands, going to be a dead weight? or will it be a live and realizable security? That is, supposing this road were finished tomorrow, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and the Company made default, and it came into our hands, would it be a bill of expense or a means of income to us? That is a very important point, because upon that rests in part the value of the security in the contingency that the Company shall make default and that the property shall come

into our hands. What have we to say in reference to this? Will the road be a dead security or a living and paying security? We have but three things to go upon. We have experience in the first place. What is that experience? In 1882, the gross receipts of the Canada Pacific Railway were \$2,449,824. In 1883 they were \$5,420,913; and the net of nine months' traffic comes to pretty

NEARLY A MILLION OF DOLLARS.

I think that, so far as the road between the Rocky Mountains and Port Arthur, added on to the road between Algoma Mills and Sudbury Junction and Montreal, is concerned, it settles the fact conclusively that that portion of the road at least is a paying property and will give a net earning over and above all expenses. We have only to ask ourselves this question: whether, when that line of communication between Sudbury Junction and Port Arthur, around the north of Lake Superior, is filled in, and when the gap across the the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops is filled in, and the whole trade of the country has a chance to extend and grow upon this line, we think, in the light of the past experience of the road, this will be a paying road, or will involve us in expense? I believe it will pay for its running and give a profit in net earnings every year. Have we anything to back up this contention? Yes, we have the analogy of the roads I have mentioned before. Take the Union Pacific, and its net earnings have risen from \$5,000,000 and odd in 1874, to \$7,000,000 and odd in 1879, and, after the consolidation, from \$7,000,000 and odd in 1879, to \$12,000,000 in 1882. Are the lands and the country and the capabilities of the country through which our road goes so infinitely inferior; is the extent of country that is to be traversed which gives nothing to feed the line with traffic so infinitely greater in our own country, that we can hope for this analogy to have no force and weight when applied to our own road? I believe the reverse is the case. I believe the capacities and capabilities of our own lands through which our road runs; I believe the lesser tract of barren and unproductive country which cannot feed the line of travel; I believe the shorter line following the meridian between the centres of traffic on the east and the centres of traffic upon the west, are immeasurably in favor of our line, and I believe, Sir, that if the before mentioned line shows such an increase in gross earning as it has, our own line may safely be asserted to be beyond the possibility of doubt and reasoning by analogy, a line that will pay its way and

LEAVE SOMETHING TO THE NET.

Take the analogy of the Central Pacific. In 1871, the net earnings were \$5,000,000 and odd; in 1882, they have risen to \$8,000,000 and odd. Take the Northern Pacific, and in 1882 the gross earnings were \$5,000,000 and odd, and in 1883 they were \$9,000,000, and a little more. Taking all this into consideration, I say the conclusion of the argu-

ment from analogy will be that our road will not be a dead security, but a paying and constantly increasing paying investment. Then we are to take the element of probability in. I started to make a calculation just about the time the Speaker took his Chair. I am exceedingly sorry, looking at the country's advantage and the enlightenment of this House which would have been possible, that the Speaker took his Chair as early as he did, before I had an opportunity of completing that interesting calculation; but I will give you the germ of the calculation, and hon. gentlemen can work it out themselves. I said to myself, is it too much to ask, is it too much to think, that, during the next ten years, we shall have at least 50,000 people yearly thrown into our North West? Does that appear reasonable to the members of this House, that, during the next ten years, an average of 50,000 people a year will enter that country? Does it appear reasonable to say that, of that 50,000, 40,000 will belong to the agricultural classes? I believe it is not unreasonable. Is it unreasonable to say that, of these 40,000, one out of four will hold a farm; that is, that out of that number of people, there will be 8,000 farmers, and that each of these will bring under cultivation twenty acres of good grain lands each year? If you take that, and put it on the rate of progress, and count it up for ten years, you will be surprised at the vista it opens up of production, accelerating and increasing production, which will feed the line of traffic, and develop and make prosperous a trade of the dimensions of which we today can form no actual—can scarcely form a probable—estimate. So I believe in the probabilities. Facts showing that today the road

IS PAYING AS FAR AS IT IS BUILT,

probabilities leading us to believe that a large increase will take place in the productiveness of the soil which will form a basis for trade in the future, I think we are altogether within the mark when we conclude that that line of road, once built, will not be a loss to whoever may happen to own it, but will be a means of income and a source of profit. Therefore, when they come and ask for a loan of \$22,500,000, and offer us securities worth \$141,247,953—because I add the \$35,000,000 of stock, at the rate of 60 per cent., which will make \$21,000,000—I believe the security is ample. I believe they come in an honourable and manly way and say, we want a loan which you can give better than others; we offer securities which we would not like to give into the hands of any other; we make the bargain for mutual advantage, and we trust for mutual benefit to the two parties concerned. Now, sir, that exhausts about the line of thought that I conducted with myself, and brings me to this result; that it is a foregone conclusion with the people, and a necessity of this country, that the line of trans-continental road shall be built, that the Company, having proceeded so far with unexampled push and energy towards the completion of that road, and having been involved in these temporary difficulties, if such you may call them, are reasonable in coming before us and in asking us for a loan which shall accrue to the mutual advantage of the company and

of the country: and I, for one, am prepared to vote for loaning the \$22,500,000 with the contingent loan which may possibly come upon us in 1888, taking the security which is offered us and the percentage they promise to pay; and I believe that the country outside, which, despite all that was said against that contract in 1880-81, approved of it and sent back those who framed and those who ratified it with such a large majority, looking upon that road in the light of a necessity now as then, will regard those who put this through in this Parliament, and

VOTE FOR THE SPEEDY COMPLETION

on such terms, as having only carried out their behests, as having done what was given them to do, and will approve of their action when they next come before the polls to ask the suffrages of the people.

Now, I will ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments whilst I present another thought. Not only were the propositions made by this company, and the propositions entertained by the Government, brought before me as a subject for investigation and approval, but I thought that something else was necessary. I believed that wisdom did not reside solely in myself. I knew that human nature on this side of the House was fallible as is human on the other side of the House, or as human nature is generally; and I said to myself, it is possible that new light may be thrown upon this question, and I will wait and listen. I will carefully observe, I will weigh, as far as I possible can, the arguments of those hon. gentlemen who are opposed to this measure, and if they give me good grounds for rejecting this proposal, I am willing to take the onus and responsibility of rejecting it. So, Sir, I listened earnestly and attentively to the Minister of Railways, who expounded this matter to us, and I listened with an equally earnest attention to the hon. leader of the Opposition, who made out the opposite case, and who contended against the resolutions which are placed before us. Now, Sir, what did I extract from the long and able speech of the hon. member for West Durham? I listened to it from first to last. I did not content myself with that, but I have read that hon. gentleman's speech over three consecutive times since I received it in the *Hansard*. I think no hon. gentleman on this side of the House, or on the other side, will be able to say that I have not given it an attention and an investigation equal to all that it deserves at my hands; and I did it with a desire of finding out what were the strong points—if there were any strong points—which might be urged against the resolutions before the House. Well, Sir, what do I find? I find this: that, with that facility of bringing up buried issues and points about questions that have been settled over and over again, the hon. gentleman occupied nearly the whole of his speech with debating issues and questions which had been

SETTLED BY THIS PARLIAMENT.

and settled by the country after they had been settled by this Parliament. That hon. gentleman did not like a great many things; he was curious to know a great many more things; and what he did not like, and what he was curious to know, in nine cases out of ten, were questions which, in my humble opinion, had no more to do with the settlement of this question which is now before us, than a magazine article upon Bacteria has to do with chemical notation. In the first place, the hon. gentleman did not like this company coming back again to Parliament. Well, Sir, we would all have much preferred that they should never have come back again and asked for a re-arrangement, or a reconsideration of this question. We would have much preferred to see them go on with their contract, and complete the road in 1886. But the point to be observed is that they came back, and whether we liked it or not was not the question. That was the problem we had to solve, and it is no use for us to grumble because they came back when we did not want them to come back. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman satirized the able resources of the Syndicate. He seemed to make a great deal of merit over the fact that this Syndicate had been lauded in years gone by as composed of exceptionally able gentlemen, financially; and now that this company has come back to us in the way it has, he supposed that he had good grounds for turning back upon the Government, and the party who support the Government, because the great advantage we hoped to obtain through this Syndicate was not realized. Well,

Sir, I do not think there was any man, in 1881, or since 1881, who for a moment supposed that any Syndicate were going to take money enough out of their own pockets,

OR HAD POCKETS DEEP ENOUGH

out of which to take the requisite money, to complete the gigantic enterprise of building a line of railway from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. It was not that for which we looked for a set of able men, but we looked for a set of able men who, by their financial character and standing, should be able to put the Company in the shape of realizing from the assets which should be placed at its disposal, and supplementing the deficiencies by their credit. This, Sir, the Company has done, and having done that it is not open to the ridicule and satire which was heaped upon it by the hon. gentleman.

He has declared that speed meant cost. Sir, that whole question was discussed in the debate on the Address. The hon. gentleman went into elaborate calculations then to prove to this House that speed meant cost. He proved it to his own satisfaction then; he did not any more than prove it to his own satisfaction this time. Possibly, speed does mean cost in some cases, but, to my mind, the construction of that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway that has been constructed is not one of those cases. When you take into account that you might just about as easily take in supplies for 10,000 people as for 7,000; when you take into account that railway building today is largely done by new and improved machinery, when you take into account that the speed with which it is carried out leaves less dead capital lying on their hands, and puts them into a position of realizing more quickly on the outlay—I believe when you put all these things together, you will come to the conclusion that in this case, and in many cases, it is not true that speed means cost. In this case there are two prior considerations. Speed means benefit to the Company, because it keeps dead capital from lying on its hands, and speed means benefit to this Dominion, because it opens our highway just so many years earlier than it otherwise would be opened. Sir, the hon. gentleman opposite dislikes

THE MODE OF BUILDING.

He did not like the construction company and the directors which form part of that construction company; he took it for granted that the directors did form part of the construction company. Sir, that is a question that is not germane to the issue which is before the House. The construction company, the mode in which the road was built—those are matters which I think do not touch directly upon the question whether things, being as they are today, it is proper for this Parliament to make the loan which is provided for in the resolutions. He also complained of the change of route; but the change of route is also outside, in my judgment, of the question which is before us. He is also opposed to the issue of stock and the manner in which it was issued. I think the ground is tenable here, that if we make a contract with the company and pay them so much to do the work, and provide that our rates upon the railway afterwards are dependent upon the actual amount of money that is used in the construction of the road—I say, in that case, it is not very germane to the subject as to how they issue, or how they dispose of, the stock which is their own, and which does not enter as a factor therefore, into the cost with reference to the road. Again, the hon. gentleman was opposed to monopoly, and disallowance. But this disallowance is apart altogether from the question at issue, and this monopoly was thoroughly discussed and settled when the contract was ratified, and the people have already passed upon it. He also ridiculed the opening up of a United States port; and my hon. friend from Queen's County, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), grew very virtuously indignant because we were going to have connections of this road reaching to some great city or cities in the United States. Sir, I yield to no one in this House in my desire to see a line of railway which shall pass through Canadian Territory from the extreme east to the extreme west. I will go as far as any hon. member in putting forth the power of the country to have that idea thoroughly carried out; but at the same time I will never consent

TO BUILD UP A CHINESE WALL

between us and the United States, with respect to the running of this road and the points from which it shall gather or to which it shall carry the traffic which comes to it. I will not go for that. But I hold

that, for commercial and prudent reasons too, and for national reasons, if you like, it is within the competence and duty of this country to see that we plant our hands wherever we can draw in a single dollar of traffic or make our road more profitable than it would otherwise be. I think it will go without saying, before this House, that the point of shipment directs or controls the destination of the freight which is shipped. We have a trans-continental line of railway. A great deal that will be shipped across that line will be shipped from American ports in the west—will be shipped from Asia, China or Japan, with a destination in some of the eastern ports of the United States. It will be a detriment to our road, a detriment to the increase of trade and commerce upon that road, if we are not prepared to receive and forward freight by the cheapest and most rapid means within our power, over our road, as far as we can and then forward it to the destination for which it is freighted. There is a large amount of traffic which we hope to draw over the road which will not begin in Canada but outside of the Dominion; a large amount of traffic from the eastern seaboard of the United States, which we hope to carry over the road. Now, can we do so, with the best prospect of increasing the volume of our trade, unless we have connections so as to hold out inducements in the centres where the trade starts to take hold of the traffic and carry it through to its destination. Therefore, I say that it is of the utmost importance that the road shall throw out its connections towards the great seaports of the United States, in order

TO GATHER TRAFFIC FROM THEM

and bring it up to the company's main line. There are two divisions of the prospective trade. There is one which will start from the west in and out of Canada and end at an eastern port of embarkation for Europe, going through our own country. That is the kind which we must keep within our own control. That is the traffic which starts in the west and goes towards the east, bound for the old country markets, and that is the kind which I would be no patriot and not worthy of the trust reposed in me, if I did not declare should embark at Canadian ports. But although I believe in that doctrine, I do not believe that we should not place ourselves so as to be unable to gather traffic, destined for the eastern cities of the country south of us, and carry freight at the lowest cost, and thereby increase our volume of trade. The traffic which starts from the west and is bound for the old country, let us keep for our Canadian ports; but, as regards all that we can profitably draw from outside sources—traffic which begins in countries outside, and is carried to countries outside our own, on this continent, let us have every facility for carrying that traffic. So much with respect to this matter of United States outlet. There is just one expression which particularly struck me in the hon. gentleman's speech, and which I will quote as he gave it. He said: "We may be exposed to the risks," (speaking about this partnership with the railway company) "but it is not likely we shall have any of the profits." In my opinion that is the cardinal defect in the criticisms given to these resolutions by hon. gentlemen opposite. They have taken the ground that the Canadian Pacific Railway is an enemy to Canada, and must be watched; that it is of no national importance; that the company have all the advantages and we have all the risk and none of the advantages. If by the power of my arms I could take up the whole Canadian Pacific Railway and throw the track into the deep sea, I want to know what would be the sensation with which

CANADIANS WOULD AWAKEN TOMORROW

when they realized the fact that they had no Canadian Pacific Railway, no line running from Montreal, Brockville and Callander across to the Far West, 1,131 miles, with its steel rails through that great undeveloped, but rich and promising country? Would they think there were no advantages connected with the building of that road? We may give the company all the money and subsidies we have given them, and even supplement those amounts with this additional aid in the form of a loan; and yet with all these risks and gifts, I undertake to say that the benefit which the Dominion realizes from the operation of that road is far greater than the cost involved to the country. Sir, I will make another confession. I had the curiosity this morning to read the whole of the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, delivered in the House of 1880-81, upon the Canadian Pacific Railway contract; that was when the contract was being sub-

mitted and the House called on to decide as to whether it should be ratified or not. I read that speech from the beginning to the end; and what are my conclusions? Simply these: that the hon. gentleman, when he made his speech on the resolutions now before the House, had the same set of models and patterns as he had in 1880-81. The only thing new is the little different material he has run through them. It was "may be" and "may happen" from the beginning to the end of his speech in 1881; it is "may be" and "may happen" almost from the beginning to the end of his speech this session. One of the hon. gentleman's "may be's" in 1881, was this: "may be the company would never begin to construct the road." But they did begin it. Another was that "may be the members of the company would abscond." They have not done so. Another was, that "may be the company would never build the Lake Superior section." But they have shown their earnestness in commencing that work. Another was, that "may be the company

WOULD LOCK UP THE LANDS

and hold them until some future period when they could get higher prices for them." But they have not held the lands; they have sold all they possibly could sell. Another was, that "may be the scheme would ruin the country." But the country has not been much ruined by it. Another was, that "may be the scheme would ruin and submerge the party." But the party still stands intact. Sir, at the conclusion of all those "may be's," the hon. gentleman stood up straight and spoke to the hon. members on this side of the House in the following language:—

"I shall not venture to hope that this House will reject it but I do not doubt that an indignant country, although you will not give it time now to raise its voice, will take the earliest opportunity to inflict a summary penalty upon those persons, offenders for a second time, who having, once betrayed, when entrusted with power, their country's honour, and having been forgiven, have now taken advantage of the opportunity which a too confiding people conferred upon them to betray, in the same transaction, her most vital and material interests."

That, Sir, was the concluding sentence which fell like a thunder clap of warning upon the House, and which showed that, as the hon. gentleman did not properly gauge the connecting circumstances which surrounded the question, he had equally failed in gauging, as every statesman, especially one who aspires to be the Leader of a party, should be well able to gauge—he failed to gauge the temper of the Canadian people, with respect to this subject. Have we not then good grounds for concluding that as he failed then to rightly gauge the importance of the question and the sentiment of the country, he may as certainly fail in this instance.

Now, Sir, I shall take up some few points of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). I am sorry he is not in his place, but as he is not, it is not my fault. He commences with a warning. Will any hon. gentleman in this House, who has watched him from his seat, year by year, say if he can recollect a single instance in which that hon. gentleman did not commence his speech with a warning. The hon. gentleman is in love and delighted with warnings. An old historical legend, which takes us away back into the times of Greece and the Trojans, tells us that there was a

PROPHETESS BY THE NAME OF CASSANDRA.

She had the divine gift of prophecy, but it was fated that her prophecies should never be believed. She walked about the streets of Troy, and the burden of her prediction was, "Troy shall be destroyed; woe unto Troy; Troy shall be destroyed; woe unto the City of Troy." Year after year that plaintive cry of Cassandra went abroad in the streets of Troy, until the people became indignant and indifferent; and at last, when she passed by their way, they would simply say, one to the other: "It is only the mad Cassandra, let her rave." It may happen that the multiplied warnings—warnings made when the hon. gentleman was in power, and since—will become wearisome to the people, and to his party, and that when he raises his fruitful succession of warnings, the people may just jog each other as they pass by, and say: "It is only the mad Cassandra." What are the warnings which the hon. gentleman has given us on the subject of the resolutions? The first is this: I warn you that if you endorse that Bill you will have to pay it. The second one is: I warn you if you pass the resolu-

tions, the company is not bound to, and will not, complete this road by 1886. Well, Sir, that warning was effectually voided by the utterances of the Minister of Railways, who has, I hope, set that question at rest in this House. He then goes on to warn us that the road will not be built in four years; he warns the Finance Minister that he may find it hard to borrow money; he warns him that the surplus may give out—and that is a warning upon which, I am bound to say, he is particularly well able to talk. He warns him that the importations may diminish; he warns us—no, he does more, he confidently predicts—and the old Latin line comes to one's mind, *ab uno disce omnes*—confidently predicts what? Here is what the hon. member for South Huron says:—

"Then we see from declarations in this House—we see in the newspapers of a certain Province, we see in every direction, that one of the great Provinces of the Dominion is seriously dissatisfied with its financial position, and that it is not likely to consent to this \$30,000,000 being given, unless other and greater concessions are made, unless other and still greater liabilities are incurred."

THAT IS A STATEMENT IN COLD BLOOD,

that if we advance this loan the demands of a certain province will not be satisfied until another \$30,000,000 more are given to it. I give that as a specimen of the extravagant predictions of the hon. gentleman opposite; and as we know how close to probability that one is, we may take it as a fair sample of the probability of his other warnings being verified. Well, Sir, he warns us, first, that this is but the initial instalment, and again that it may turn out to be simply a Grand-Trunk affair. Sir, with reference to this Grand-Trunk affair, I think the hon. member for Cardwell pretty well set it in sufficient light when he spoke on that question. I deny that they are parallel cases. I say they are as widely different as possible. In the first place, with reference to the Grand Trunk Railway, it was built by money subscribed by people abroad, which was sent to this country and used in building a road for developing and opening up this country. In the other case, all the assets and money which have been given to the company for the building of this trans-continental line is money which has been advanced, and land subsidy which has been granted by this country—a magnificent, and I must say a sufficient subvention—one which we are not called upon to increase, and one which I do not think it is the temper of, this Parliament or the country to increase in the way of subvention or gift. Add this to the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Cardwell and the considerations which he adduced, and I think it is patent to most hon. gentlemen that there is no fair parallel between the Grand Trunk Railway and this railway, with reference to the lien we may have upon them. The lien we have on the Grand Trunk was placed where it is because of considerations which cannot now enter into this question. It is still a liability, and the time will probably come when this liability will be met, and the country will get back what it paid into that road in the way of capital. Sir, the hon. gentleman has given these amongst other warnings. Now the only process by which we can arrive at any fair estimate of what importance

WE ARE TO ATTACH TO THESE WARNINGS,

is to go back to the past warnings from the same hon. gentleman. If we have any doubts about the matter they can only be set at rest in that way. Let us go back to his record and collate a number of the warnings he has uttered, and if he has proved a fair and a true prophet in the past, it is possible he may do so in the present instance. But, on the other hand, if he has proved a false prophet in the past, it is quite possible that his prophecies will have the same outcome at the present time. I think if we take the Budget speeches which were delivered by that hon. gentleman from 1874 to 1878, we will find prophecy and non-fulfilment running through from the very first to the very last. In 1874 he came down with his Budget, and when placing his \$3,000,000 of extra taxation on the people, he concluded that he would thenceforward be able to dispense with any additional taxation, and that the prospects of the country for being able to sustain itself were fairly good. In 1875 he had reason to believe that there would be a reasonable surplus for the current year. In 1876 these confident forecasts of the hon. gentleman's are given a new turn, both by the mournful prologue with which he commences his speech in 1876, and the still more

mournful tones in which he alluded to the falling off of trade to the extent of \$20,000,000. In 1877, despite his hopeful forecasts, a deficit of \$2,000,000 stared him in the face, and he put a tax on tea to help him to meet it. But then he thinks that in that year the country is about coming to clear water, and it will be all right afterwards. But the next year comes, and there is another deficiency and there was a foreshadowing of the hated income tax. As a man of forecast, the history of the hon. member for South Huron, from 1874 to 1878, will not make us feel that his authority in that regard is of any very great weight. But let us go from forecast to prophecy, and see how he has succeeded. Any man may

MAKE A MISTAKE IN FORECAST,

but if a man has the divine afflatus breathed upon him, if he has the power of prophecy, there can be no difficulty in his case; if he can prophesy, and is a true prophet, his predictions will come true; if not, they will not come true. The hon. gentleman prophesied in 1878, and the subject of his prophecy was the hon. Finance Minister. He said:

"But when the people come to understand what is now being proposed, the chances of my hon. friend ever succeeding in regaining his place in this House is, if I know anything of the temper of his constituency, problematical in the last degree." The hon. Finance Minister, however, did come back, and he is here today, and the fallacy of the prophecy is shown by the fact. In 1878, the hon. gentleman again lifted up his voice and prophesied—and this time he had two strings to his bow. The subject of this prophecy is the hon. Minister of Railways and the National Policy:

"The hon. member for Cumberland, when he comes back to power, if he ever does, of which I must faintly express my doubt, at all events at the next election, will find himself so crippled and confined in every quarter, that if he did make some slight readjustment of the Tariff he will be obliged to settle down on the general Tariff, not affording manufacturers one whit more assistance or protection than that which he now condemns on our part."

Sir, the hon. member for Cumberland did come back at the next elections, did help to introduce and to carry forward the very same Tariff policy which he propounded when he was a member of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. In 1879 this hon. gentleman again lifts up his voice and prophecies, this time about the party. He says:

"The time is coming, and coming fast, when they will wake up from their short-lived delusion to find themselves wiser and poorer by many a million than they are tonight. I warn the hon. gentleman that then he will find that for the sake of obtaining a temporary party triumph, he and those who support him will, in the long result, prove to have utterly and hopelessly wrecked, not only their own fortunes, and the fortunes of their party, but I very much fear the fortunes of the country, that have been most unfortunately committed to their charge."

Sir, the events have spoken after the prophecy, and have shown upon what tenable grounds he prophesied. In 1880, again

HE LIFTED UP HIS VOICE AND PROPHECIED, and this time he spoke about the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, saying:

"They will rush upon the fate which awaits them so soon as the people have an opportunity of pronouncing their opinions at the polls."

The people had the opportunity of pronouncing their opinions at the polls. They did it in 1882, and their opinion is shown by the majority of seventy which came to back up and carry through the contract which was introduced by the Government; and, sad to relate, the prophet was left at home. In 1880, he again prophesied as follows:—

"I might recall the doom which, two years later, overtook the men who treated with scorn the warnings we had uttered. I think the country is likely to repeat its vengeance, and that, if these hon. gentlemen do not take care, the doom which overtook them in 1873 will be visited upon them in 1883."

Well, sir, in this prophecy the hon. gentleman left himself an outlet—he said, "if they do not take care;" therefore, I suppose he will come to the conclusion that they did take care, and so avoided the trouble that he promised for them. So much for the hon. gentleman's prophecies. Now, I repeat what I said

before—why should we be plagued with this continual iteration of warning and prophecy? Can we wonder that people become indignant and indifferent and pass him by with "it is only the mad Cassandra—let her rave and prophecy."

The hon. gentleman was pleased, in the plenitude of his power, the greatness of his mental strength, and the magnitude of his information, to turn to this side of the House, lift himself up in all his dignity, and ask this question: "Sir, I wonder if the hon. gentlemen ever look at the Public Accounts, or do they put implicit faith in their leaders?" If that hon. gentleman were in his place, I would say that once in a while we do look into the Public Accounts. I remember looking at a page on which there were a great many figures, which ran from 1878 to 1883, and the only places where I found a minus sign were opposite the years in which the hon. member for South Huron happened to be Financial Minister. Yes, sir, we do look at the Public Accounts; we learn a lesson from them, and the lesson bids us

BEWARE OF TRUSTING THE FINANCES

of this country to the hon. member for South Huron again. Well, sir, that hon. gentleman went a little further a short time afterwards and said: "Now, my hon. friends from the Maritime Provinces may not be as well aware of the past history of Canada as I am, and my friends around me." The hon. gentleman credited the members from the Maritime Provinces with much of the effects of isolation—they had not read so much as the hon. gentleman, or informed themselves about the history of Canada. If that hon. gentleman were in his place tonight, I would venture to humbly suggest to him that the members from the Maritime Provinces and the people of the Maritime Provinces do now and then see a newspaper, do get a history of this country occasionally, and are not totally benighted, even with regard to the history of older Canada. I would remind that hon. gentleman that he came down on one occasion to enlighten the people of the Maritime Provinces, and with no very enlightening effect, if we may judge by the extent to which his visit increased the number of his followers there. I would venture to suggest, as he was followed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and Mr. Huntington, and as neither of these gentlemen seemed to have increased the number of their followers there, that it is only a way he has of taking vengeance on

THE PEOPLE OF THE MARITIME PROVINCES

to imply here that they are not very well informed. Well, sir, we are somewhat informed of the history of Canada. We know a few things, and amongst others we know this—we know that outside of the points I have mentioned, there are bits of history which cling around the hon. gentleman himself. We listen, sir, to his strong assurances of his patriotism and his indignant denial that he is unpatriotic, and yet we are compelled, from what little information we have, to come to some pretty strange conclusions in one or two instances. What are these instances? Were—member, as we read the Budget speeches, that, from 1874 to 1878, inclusive, that hon. gentleman in no single Budget speech, refrained from hurling back upon the preceding Government accusations respecting the enormous and reckless and insane expenditures they had heaped upon the country, and the more reckless, enormous and insane obligations to which they had committed the country. But that hon. gentleman went over to Great Britain to ask a favor, and when he reached the mother land he had no other words, in presenting his case, to utter, than these:—

"The entire debt has been incurred since for legitimate objects of public utility. The indirect advantages from these public works have been found in the remarkable rapidity with which the commerce and the material prosperity of the Dominion have been developed. The revenue has shown a continuous surplus each year since Confederation."

Either the hon. gentleman was wrong in his first statement or he was dishonest in his second, and our opinion of him is not raised when we find that, on his return he gave this reason for his contradictory statements, that it was necessary to show

THE SILVER SIDE OF THE SHIELD

in the Mother Country when soliciting a favour, but he kept the brazen side for his own people at home. The hon. gentleman speaks in indignant tones of his patriotism. On this point I have gathered some little information, from a statement made by the hon. gen-

tleman in 1882, when he occupied in this House his position of chief financial critic of the Government. He said:

"Why, Sir, I told them today that Canada is a country in which no man is free to buy or to sell, to eat or to drink, to travel or to stand still, without paying toll to some extortioner or other."

If the eminently patriotic gentleman is to carry abroad statements of that kind, it becomes of the first necessity that a man with equally strong lungs should travel closely behind him, and, as these utterances go forth, cry out with a loud voice: "Nevertheless this is a Canadian patriot of the first water." I think I have taken up most of the objections which have been urged as reasons why these resolutions should not be passed. But there are a few left out of the abundant surplus—I am glad that the hon. gentleman has a little portion of a surplus in some way—there are a few left from the salient remarks of the hon. member for Queen's which I did not quite overtake before recess and with reference to which I have a few remarks to make now. When the hon. gentleman spoke of

THE OLD LANDLORD SYSTEM

of this country, and tried to make it appear that we were introducing into the North-West territories a revived type and a perfect pattern of the old, exacting, and, in some respects, tyrannical landlord system of the Old Country, it is only necessary to make that statement where people can hear it to show its inaccuracy. It needs no refutation other than simply to state it. There is no analogy between colonization land companies and the land regulations in the North-West, and the old system of landlord tenure and the like which obtains in the Old Country. The hon. gentleman said, no doubt, that there were bulls and bears outside who are manipulating the stock of this company, and naughty men inside who are making capital out of it, and rival speculators who were found in every way plotting schemes in relation to this measure; but I tell the hon. gentleman that Canada has too large a stock in this road, too many of her interests are bound up in its successful completion, for us to sit idly by and see the bulls and bears tearing this to pieces, and naughty men doing their best to destroy the prospects of the company, and rival speculators trying to obtain an advantage out of this thing, in which we are deeply interested. In this question, the motto of Canada is *nemo me impune lacessit*. The hon. gentleman speaks of the enormous sums

WHICH HAVE BEEN EXPENDED

by the company in side enterprises. If he will make a calculation, he will see that the amount so expended does not exceed the sum of \$1,800,000, so that the sums are not very enormous compared with the expenditure and the estimated cost of the whole road. I protest against the way the hon. gentleman puts the terms of this resolution. Any stranger sitting in the galleries and listening to the hon. gentleman will suppose that the proposition before the House was to give this company \$30,000,000 in cash as a gift, which will never be repaid. The hon. gentleman begged the question entirely in so stating it. It is a loan which must be paid back to the uttermost farthing, or this Government will have its perfect forfeiture in the taking over of the securities given for the loan. It is not a gift but simply a square bargain. I thank hon. members very kindly for the attention they have given me. I know I have trespassed longer on your time than I should, but I trust you will pardon, in a comparatively new member, what you might not be disposed to pass over in the case of an older and more experienced member. I have never yet had an opportunity of expressing myself with reference to the railway policy of this country, and I thought it would not be amiss for me, at this stage of my political life, to give the reasons why I intend to support these resolutions. It will not be more than a quarter of a century from this time when the next generation, looking at this completed work and at the multitude of enterprises clustering around it, will come to the conclusion that in the inception and carrying out and completion of this road, the fathers of this Canadian people acted wisely and well, and that they have raised a monument which is more imperishable than bronze, a monument which will stand to their credit and endure to their benefit so long as Canada shall be Canada, and countries shall look upon and honor public spirit.